

September 19, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

They are learning culture and customs. They have fought for our country and died—but they did not die in vain. That is the way the war is helping us.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Teresa Paolilla, fifth grade, first place)

This war is the most unpopular, most talked about and the most confusing war the United States was ever in. Young men have burned their draft cards, marched in protest of the war. You hear many views expressed on radio and TV. It is claimed that we are the aggressor, and have no right to be in South Vietnam.

The Constitution of the United States states that only Congress shall have the power to declare war. Then the question is: Are we at war and why?

To try to understand, we must go back in history. After the war with France in 1954, Vietnam was separated into the North and South. South Vietnam made an agreement with the United States that upon request the United States would send men and material. The Senate ratifies all treaties and commitments. We are committed to send material and men to any nation that has signed treaties or agreements with the United States if they are invaded and ask our help.

North Vietnam sent material and men to support the Viet Cong and their revolution with the South Vietnam government. They feel that they are not invading a foreign soil because Vietnam is still part of their country—therefore they are not aggressors—the United States is.

West Germany and East Germany is a divided country and we recognize West Germany. North and South Korea is a divided country and we recognize South Korea. South Korea asked our help and we sent men and material. The war never ended—there is only an armistice.

Under the UN Charter all member nations are supposed to send troops to maintain peace when a member-nation is invaded. The United States of America has signed this obligation and other various treaties. The President, the Commander-in-Chief, has the power to send men and material to police a country or to maintain peace when that country is invaded by another, but only when that country requests our help. We did the same thing in the Dominican Republic when Cuban Communists invaded that country and when peace was restored we withdrew our troops.

In South Vietnam the USA wants a political solution to the Vietnam question and not a military one. Recently President Johnson wrote a personal letter to the Premier of North Vietnam. He offered to stop the bombing of the North and the sending of more men to South Vietnam if the North Vietnamese would also stop sending men and material. This direct offer of peace was rejected by North Vietnam.

We are trying to follow along the lines of Pope Paul's suggestion for an honorable peace. Many of our boys are dying in South Vietnam to protect the freedom of other people and thereby protect the freedom of the USA.

I am proud to be an American. We have the legal and moral right to be in South Vietnam. Right or wrong I am an American. I support our country because we value human life—and men have laid down their lives to protect their own rights and those of other human beings. By protecting the rights and freedom of other people, we thereby protect our own rights and freedom and that is what the war in Vietnam means to me.

THE VIETNAM WAR—A REAL WAR OR POLITICAL WAR?

(By Robert Benvenuto, sixth grade, first place)

Vietnam is a small insignificant country in southern Asia that has captured the hearts and minds of all men because of man's weapon to build and destroy other nations and peoples. The Vietnam war started as a political war caused by many disagreements between North and South Vietnam. North Vietnam declared war on the South. The United States felt that she should step in and try to stop the Communists from spreading their doctrines and cruel ways of life. After this, the war in Vietnam became a "real war."

While in the Vietcong territory, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong suffered great military losses. Even with these hardships there still seemed plenty of fight left in them. Despite America's decision in June to bomb oil dumps and installations in the vicinity of Hanoi and Haiphong, North Vietnamese infiltration into the South continued at a high rate. Notwithstanding their supply problems, the North Vietnamese boosted their total of troops fighting in South Vietnam to some fifty thousand by the end of 1966. This is a "real war."

Pope Paul, knowing the results of war, pleaded with all to cease fire. He knew a compromise on all sides was necessary. The Communists failed to see his ideas for compromise and peace. Therefore they demanded the withdrawal of all United States troops prior to the peace talks. Because of this the United States stated that they would meet the terms if the Communists would do the same. The Communists then made an attack on South Vietnam the next day. This is a "real war."

When President Johnson was running for reelection he commented that he would not send any more troops to Vietnam unless necessary. Circumstances have warranted doubling the number of troops in South Vietnam, raising the total to 327,000 at its peak. With more United States troops in action casualties took a sharp upward turn. Because of this, in March, the United States dead for the first time exceeded the South Vietnamese dead.

In the air war the United States lost more than 400 planes during the year, the bulk of them being shot down by intense ground fire. During the year there was a lull in air strikes against the North as President Johnson launched an intense peace drive. But with no response from Hanoi, United States jets again screamed northward after bombing was stopped for 37 days. This is a "real war."

For Americans, 1966 in Vietnam was a year of continuing hope and anguish. Hope stemmed from the fact that the military position of the United States and its allies was more improved. The anguish derived from the undisputable fact that this improvement was wrought with higher casualties and cost. The hope of all Americans and peace-loving people is in being victorious in the war and returning once more to the "the land of the free and home of the brave." It is the hope of America that this real war will be a real and lasting peace for all nations.

MY REACTION TO THE BURNING OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

(By Susan Hallran, seventh grade, first place)

My feeling is very strong for my country. I love it and would never want to see it destroyed. The American flag stands for my country, so I feel that same way about it. Anyone who burns the American flag could only be mentally ill, or not an American citizen.

If an American citizen burns the flag, in my opinion he is committing an act of treason. It really makes me angry to know that a citizen could burn a symbol that stands for peace and justice and also the representations of other states. The American flag is not only a symbol, but something hundreds of men have risked their lives for. The flag lets everyone know that all men are equal and that all love their country.

If I had been there when those men burned the American flag, I would have tried to stop them. I couldn't just stand by and see the flag, which represents so much, burned to ashes in front of my eyes. The people who were there and didn't try to stop this action should be totally ashamed and not be able to call themselves American citizens.

FLAG BURNING

(By Patricia Passadino, seventh grade, second place)

Our country is a strong and steadfast one until a law violated against its very meaning is permitted to occur.

A peace rally against the war was held some two weeks ago in Central Park. Demonstrators got carried away and very boldly burned the flag of the United States of America. This mob mentality is a sin and crime against our country as well as God. We have a duty to love and perfect our country. This goal cannot be obtained if the people of the states act so violently against the flag.

This act, performed in public, is the lowest form of government ridicule possible. No punishment is too harsh on the person or persons involved when we think of the blood, sweat and tears put into and represented by our flag. The development of a barren territory and the freedom of the individual—this is the meaning of the flag to hundreds of our citizens.

So many have fought for it and are striving to keep it—what of these ignorant individuals who would destroy it? We must overcome them and wipe them out and continue to progress in the ways seen fit for our welfare and that of our government.

As a student and prospective voter of the United States I feel that such treason cannot exist if we are to continue on in life. There cannot be any motive behind these insane people. If this were to be overlooked a great nation would collapse.

An act as horrible as this cannot and will not go unpunished.

THE BURNING OF THE FLAG

(By Annette Incabone, eighth grade, first place)

I think the burning of the flag is showing that the boys in the United States are downright cowards. Look at all the boys shedding their blood in Vietnam for the freedom of our country. When our enemies see pictures of the United States flag being torn, dirtied and burned to ashes with no one being punished for it they laugh at the stupid Americans because they feel they are so weak minded.

Anyone who destroys the American flag is an enemy to himself and his country and would think nothing of conspiring with the Communists. They would love to force our freedom into dictatorship.

Our flag stands for freedom and always will.

As an American I feel that people who destroy or mishandle the flag in any way should be punished severely by fines or imprisonment.

I wonder how our forefathers would feel if they were alive today and could see how our flag is maliciously set afire and spit upon knowing of all the blood that was shed to preserve our flag and freedom. Again I say,

September 19, 1967

A4660

punishment for those who mistreat our flag. Let us remember Philip Nolan—"the man without a country."

THE BURNING OF THE FLAG

(By Patricia Slesarchik, eighth grade, second place)

On April 15th something happened which all Americans can be very proud of. The American flag was burned by Americans. They should really be proud of what they did for our country. It was a real milestone in what our morals are coming to. When another country burns our flag, everyone is shocked and that is enough to break-off diplomatic relations. So what happens when our own country does it? We can't break off diplomatic relations.

What really gets me is that no one said anything. Nobody stopped it. Are we all so hardened as not to care? This time they can't blame it only on teenagers. There were grownups there too. Why didn't they stop it?

The burning of the flag didn't have anything to do with the war in Vietnam. Oh yes, it started out that way, but even if you don't like the way your country does something, out of respect you would not burn its flag!

Teenagers were very fairly represented at the demonstrations. Whose fault is it? Their parents? Maybe. After all, they were supposed to instill in their offspring a respect for their country.

But I doubt if that was the case with all of them. Most likely it was that they would be big shots with their friends. They probably didn't expect it to go so far, and when it did, they were afraid to speak up.

Why? Was it worth it—to lose all of your self-respect for a few minutes of fun?

Surely none of us can be so hardened that we wouldn't be ashamed of what happened.

In contrast, take the pro-Vietnam demonstrations. No disrespect was shown to the United States. Our flag was proudly carried down Fifth Avenue. The people who took part in that can really be proud.

What is this country coming to?

Antiballistic Missile System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 1967, in my weekly report to the citizens of my district—Louisville—I predicted "that the President will succumb to a thin defense system, costing between \$3 and \$5 billion." Today President Johnson and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara announced that the United States will start building a \$5 billion antiballistic missile system which will be a prelude to an expanding defense system that might ultimately cost \$40 billion. On June 22, I joined with 35 first-term Republican Members of Congress in urging the administration to immediately establish an adequate ABM system. We sent a strongly worded resolution to Secretary McNamara demanding action at an early date. This was followed up by a meeting with the Secretary of Defense at the Pentagon, where additional arguments were voiced in favor of such a system.

In April, I sent a questionnaire to

every resident of Louisville in which I asked the question, "Should the United States immediately begin action on an antiballistic missile system?" Sixty-two and six-tenths percent answered in the affirmative. To my mind, this is a perfect example of citizen participation in their Government. Through their elected representatives in the Congress, Americans have made their views known to the President and to the Defense Department. Continued pressure forced the President and the Secretary to bend to the will of the people.

Another Communist Graces Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. RARICK, Mr. Speaker, while gallant Americans of Polish descent struggle to preserve their homes and families in Milwaukee, their National Capital sees a Pole from the Communist-suppressed homeland arriving to aid in the international undermining of these United States.

My prayers are for our gallant Milwaukee fellow countrymen. My political regards but scorn for the Washington Socialists representing the Communist regime of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the Evening Star article of September 13 following my remarks:

NEW ENVOY'S WIFE IS ARTICULATE CAREER WOMAN, TOO

(By Toni House)

She is a satirist, translator, art collector, mother, concert-goer and loves living in an apartment.

She is an outspoken, articulate proponent of the working woman and is a shining example of combining career and home to the advantage of both.

She is the diplomatic corp's newest distaff addition, wife of Polish Ambassador Jerzy Michalowski, who, yesterday, presented his credentials to the President.

The Michalowskis are temporarily in residence at the Washington Hilton. Come the month's end they will move to their permanent residence in the Colonnade Apartments over-looking Glover Archbold Park in Northwest.

Such greenery, such trees, raptures Mrs. Michalowski—"There are more trees in that park than in all of Warsaw."

The mother of two sons interrupted a career in television writing three weeks ago when they moved to Washington.

But she has no intention of being a lady of leisure here.

The linguist said yesterday she has a great affection for the English language (which she divides into "English" and "American") and has translated about 15 works into Polish, including Hemingway, Caldwell and Miller.

Raising her eyebrows in a gesture of mock concern, she states her housekeeper once described her as a "woman who does nothing—just sits and reads or writes all day."

TRANSLATES

Before moving to Washington, Mira Michalowski finished translating an adult

novel by the late A. A. Milne, author of everyone's teddybear, "Winnie-the-Pooh."

The Polish, she said, have a great affection for Pooh and friend's creator and at his death named a Warsaw street in his honor: "Winnie-the-Pooh Street."

This is not the Michalowskis first tour in the United States. From 1957 to 1960, the ambassador was the Polish envoy to the UN.

"I loved New York," said his wife, "but I find Washington intriguing. I suspect it will take me about 6 months to find my way around."

Ambassador Michalowski replaces former Ambassador Edward Drozniak, who died last November.

The Korean National Science-Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems confronting the developing nations of Southeast Asia is the shortage of personnel capable of performing the technical tasks inherent in industrialization. Education and training are, of course, the keys to the solution of this problem, but these are not simple processes. Most of the Southeast Asian nations lack any base from which to commence any valuable training program; educational facilities are far below the necessary level. The United States and other friendly developed nations are lending what assistance they can, but this kind of aid has definite shortcomings. First, most often it cannot be adequately extensive. Second, it is Western training and education and does not provide a healthy incentive for the trainee to remain in the homeland—opportunities in the West are far too attractive. Consequently, if the shortage of qualified personnel is to be overcome, it must be overcome by the developing nations themselves.

I would like to make a few comments today on a program recently established in the Republic of South Korea which appears to be an outstanding effort to solve the technical manpower problem. The program is called the Korean National Science-Cultural Center. The program had its actual beginning in March of 1966, when Mr. Joseph Allen Patterson, then Director of the American Association of Museums, was asked to assist in the planning for a new institution to replace their science museum which had been destroyed during the war. From a series of meetings which followed, a plan evolved for a new center with a program combining all aspects of science and technology with the broad spectrum of Korean cultural history. The Korean officials realized that their people lacked an adequate base of understanding to fully appreciate or be of assistance in the rapid technological changes which are taking place in Korea. These officials further felt that the center should provide programs in the cultural history of Korea to help firmly establish for Koreans their historical identity, traditions, and heri-